UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Can Religion Survive Without the Church?

By JOSEPH ERNEST McAFEE

Bertrand Russell and Some New Ideas of Marriage

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Russia to Cut Down on Alcohol and Babies

By ANNA LOUISE STRONG

VOLUME CV NUMBER 3

Chicago, March 17, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON — LOUIS L. MANN — CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY FELLOWSHIP

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE Pamphlet Mission FOR FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROGERS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthèeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

SPECIAL!

Five Articles on Russia

by

Anna Louise Strong

Miss Strong has lived in Russia for a large part of every year since the Revolution in 1917. She has traveled in every part of the country, and has crossed Siberia and China. She knows all the leaders of the Soviet Republic and is in intimate touch with all political and social movements. These articles are written from Russia where she is now residing.

The subjects of this special series of articles are as follows:

The Fighting Farmers of Russia.
The Year of the Great "Break-Over" in Russia.
Soviet Rulers on Vacation.
Russia to Cut Down on Alcohol and Babies.
Moving Out from the Ranks in Russia, or Raising Up Managers.

These five articles will be published in successive numbers of Unity beginning with the issue for February 24.

Subscribe Now $3.00 Per Year

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 35

Can Religion Survive Without the Church?—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 37

Jottings—J. H. H. 39

ARTICLES—

A Scientist on Lawlessness—ROBERT A. MILLIKAN 35

Bertrand Russell and Some New Ideas of Marriage—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 40

Russia to Cut Down on Alcohol and Babies—ANNA LOUISE STRONG 43

POETRY—

The Plumbline of Justice—LOUIS I. NEWMAN... 39

The Sacred Ganges—WILLIAM WARE LOCKE.... 39

THE STUDY TABLE—

Exotics—FREDERICK STARR 34

CORRESPONDENCE—

Make War Unconstitutonal—VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW 47

Seminar in Mexico—HUBERT C. HERRING 47

THE FIELD—

Business Prosperity 47

Opinions of Eminent Americans on India and British Rule—(*To Be Continued*)..... 48

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CV MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1930 NUMBER 3

A SCIENTIST ON LAWLESSNESS

I begin to be disturbed when expanding knowledge or increasing power comes coincidentally with a decrease in the sense of moral values. . . . There are certain disturbing indications in America just now of such a coincidence. . . . The one is the obvious effort at *the deflation of idealism,* the ridiculing of the existence of such a thing as *a sense of duty* or of social responsibility, not, thank God, by scientists, but rather by a group of American writers which is apparently trying to create something brand new in morals; and the second is the apparently increasing lawlessness just now characteristic of American life. When we have now, and have had for twenty years, i. e., for a time long antedating the advent of Prohibition, *sixteen times the number of homicides per thousand of population that are found in England,* there is some reason for alarm. Where individuals in sufficiently large numbers are willing to destroy the basis of confidence in themselves by refusing to be governed by the rules which they themselves, with the aid of their recognized and duly established and agreed upon machinery, have set up, then obviously the foundations of civilization are being completely undermined. If that spirit co-exists with the destructive possibilities brought forth by modern science, the danger is very great.

Robert A. Millikan, in "Science And The New Civilization."

No more important work is now going forward in the field of peace than that of rewriting the Covenant of the League of Nations in conformity with the Briand-Kellogg Treaty. A committee of jurists, authorized by the League to undertake this task, has had the matter in hand for months, and only recently has made announcement of the progress of its labors. The point of attention, of course, is Article XII of the Covenant, which leaves an opening for war in this barrier of peace which is wide enough for Mars to drive through all his chariots and horsemen. To close this opening and thus make the Covenant to be as absolute in its outlawry of war as the Briand-Kellogg Treaty itself, the committee at Geneva has at last adopted a formula which gives real promise of effectiveness. As reported in newspaper despatches, it runs as follows:

> Members of the League agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to rupture, they will have recourse for its settlement to pacific means only.
>
> If the disagreement continues, the dispute shall be submitted either to arbitration or judicial settlement or to inquiry of the council. Members of the league agree that they will in no case resort to war for the solution of their disputes.

Here is the all-essential promise not to go to war for the settlement of a dispute. Here also is the resort to "arbitration or judicial settlement" which is so necessary an alternative to the arbitrament of arms. This resolution seems to us to mean business, and, in its scrupulous avoidance of so-called "sanctions," to avoid the perils incident to a drastic declaration of this kind. We are told that this formula of peace will be presented to the Assembly of the League of Nations for formal adoption at its next meeting. If adopted, and thus made a regular provision of the Covenant, UNITY will favor the immediate entrance of the United States into the League.

Echoes of the Senate's great fight against Chief Justice Hughes continue to reverberate through the country. As time has passed, it has become ever clearer that this fight was a fight not so much against Mr. Hughes either personally or professionally, as against recent tendencies of the Court which Mr. Hughes's known opinions on public questions seemed to sign and seal with sanctity. What the Senate was revolting against was, first, the waxing tendency of the Supreme Court to arrogate to itself the power to veto legislation, under the guise of passing on its constitutionality; and, secondly, the tendency to use this questionable veto power in the interest not of the people but of the great and utterly selfish financial corporations of the country. Both tendencies seemed to find perfect embodiment in the person of Charles E. Hughes. That we had an issue of first magnitude here is unquestionable. Thus, it is well to remember that such veto-power in a supreme court exists in no other nation. Judge Baldwin, in his "The American Judiciary," goes so far as to say that "this right of a court to set itself up against a legislature . . . is something which no other country in the world would tolerate." In this country it was unheard of in the beginning. The Constitution gave the Supreme Court no such power. Not until the great case of Marbury vs. Marbury, decided in 1803 under the leadership of John Marshall, was the power established as "one of the necessary corollaries of a written constitution." For half a century, until 1857, the Court allowed this power to be unexercised, when the Dred Scott case prepared the way for the Civil War. Since this War, and up to the Minimum Wage case in 1923, there have been forty-six cases in which the Supreme Court has voided laws duly passed by Congress. Since 1923, the process has gone on at an ever accelerating rate, and ever more and more in the interest of the private forces in the economic and industrial life of the state which threaten the misuse and ultimate ruin of democracy. The Sen-

ate fight was a revolt against this situation as dramatized by the nomination of Mr. Hughes, a rank reactionary. That the fight against the man failed was insignificant as compared with the fact that the most dangerously sacrosanct branch of our government was subjected to the free criticism of public opinion, and its claims to final and infallible power challenged.

Reports from Russia about the religious situation in that country have become very confusing. It is beginning to be clear that the situation is by no means as bad as at first reported, but much the same as it has been since the beginning of the Revolution. The Soviet Constitution guarantees religious liberty, which means in this case liberty for the religion of atheism as well as for any theistic type of faith. Under this Constitution churches are open, worship is carried on, priests are busy. A particularly trustworthy correspondent, now in Russia, Edward L. Keen, of the United Press, testifies that "50,000 churches are still functioning in Russia, with 30,000 priests officiating." But these are only surface facts. Deep down a war is going on between the Bolshevists and old Russia. This war was fought first on the political front against the government of the Tsar, of which the Orthodox Church was an integral and particularly offensive part. That the Church should be attacked as a counter-revolutionary influence was inevitable, for that is exactly what the institution was, and we count it a miracle that its properties and practises survive at all. Now the battle is raging on the economic front, in the fields as well as in the factories. Again the Church has allowed itself to become involved in the war for triumphant Communism, this time on the side of the *Kulaks* (the rich peasants) as formerly on the side of the exiled dukes, and is again attacked and punished for resistance to government. Deeper still is the militant athesim of the Bolshevists who see in the Christianity they know only a mask for the iniquity of that capitalist order of society which they are seeking to destroy. Couple these facts in the situation with a wide-sweeping propaganda on behalf of Communist ideas—anti-religious ideas along with all the rest—and a ruthless use of force and violence for the accomplishment of any desired end, and you encounter deeds in Soviet Russia which are indistinguishable elsewhere from persecution. Human beings are suffering terribly in Russia for religious causes, and we repeat our editorial statement of March 3rd that it is abominable. But this does not preclude us from trying to understand what is going on, and why. And especially should it not preclude us from expressing contempt for those who, like the Pope and Bishop Manning denounce as persecution what they themselves would be the first to use against their enemies if they had the power.

Thank heaven, there is some sanity in America, after all. The dismissal of Mrs. Mary Ware Dennett's case on appeal is evidence that not all Americans are stupid, vulgar, or insane. Our readers will remember the circumstances of this famous case. Mrs. Dennett, in her private life a wife, mother and grandmother, in her public life an intelligent and heroic champion of women's rights and an outstanding advocate of birth control, wrote a pamphlet of sex instruction for her adolescent sons. This pamphlet proved to be so adequate to its purpose, so successful in its performance of a most difficult task, that it became widely and gratefully used in families, medical societies, colleges and schools. After ten years and more of such usage by reputable people to serious ends, Mrs. Dennett was suddenly arrested on a charge of obscenity. Prosecuted by a brutal district-attorney, tried before an incorrigibly stupid judge, she was convicted by the usual jury chosen on the basis of utter ignorance of the issues involved, and sentenced to pay a fine of three hundred dollars, with prison sentence suspended. Mrs. Dennett promptly announced that she would stay in prison to her death before she would pay the fine, and through her able and devoted attorney, Mr. Morris Ernst, appealed the verdict to a higher court. That court has now answered in no uncertain terms. Mrs. Dennett's conviction is set aside by unanimous judgment of the court, she herself released, and her famous pamphlet made immediately mailable. There was no obscenity involved. Said Judge A. N. Hand, of the New York Circuit Court of Appeals:

> The defendant's discussion of the phenomena of sex is written with sincerity of feeling and with an idealization of the marriage relation and sex emotions. We think it tends to rationalize and dignify such emotions, rather than to arouse lust. While it may be thought by some that portions of the tract go into unnecessary details that would better have been omitted, it may be fairly answered that the curiosity of many adolescents would not be satisfied without full explanation and that no more than that is really given.
>
> It also may resonably be thought that accurate information, rather than mystery and curiosity, is better in the long run and is less likely to occasion lascivious thoughts than ignorance and anxiety. Perhaps instruction other than that which the defendant suggests would be better. That is a matter as to which there is bound to be a wide difference of opinion, but, irrespective of this we hold that an accurate exposition of the relevant facts of the sex side of life in decent language and in manifestly serious and disinterested spirit cannot ordinarily be regarded as obscene.

This decision is a body-blow against intolerant and ignorant censorship of every kind. It is a victory for good morals and good sense. It marks a crisis of liberation for the minds and lives of men.

No men in the world are so powerful and at the same time so obscure as the cardinals of the Roman Church. How many of us could name ten of these ecclesiastical princes? Are there a thousand non-Catholics in this country who could name without hesitancy the three cardinals who head the Church in America? This obscurity of the cardinals is evidence, first, of a vast and potent organization which overwhelms by sheer magnitude the individuals who lead it, and, secondly, of

an absolutism which centers all glory as well as power in the monarch, in this case, the Pope. All the more remarkable for this reason was the fame of the Cardinal Merry del Val, dead on February 26th last. Whether he was one of the supremely great men of the modern world is uncertain, so abnormal are the standards imposed by the Roman Church. But that he excelled all his contemporaries in a world-wide organization not poor in talents, and by personal ability unaided by official prestige gained a fame greater than that of the popes whom he saw come and go through the years, proves that he must at least rank high among the really great figures of the past generation. Of course, had individual capacity and training had anything to do with it, he would have been pope long ago. Leo XIII recognized the extraordinary genius of the young man, and lifted him early to high position from which entrance into the Vatican should have been easy. But in the College of Cardinals as in the democracy of America, personal eminence is a disqualification rather than otherwise for the most exalted position of official power, and thus the Vatican, like the White House, is usually occupied by mediocre men. It is pathetic to think of a man like Merry del Val superceded by men like Pius X and Benedict XIII. Yet is his fame secure as in many ways the greatest and most powerful Roman prince of his time.

The death of D. H. Lawrence, the English novelist, brings to an early end a tragic career. Gifted as few men have ever been gifted with the genius of great literature, Lawrence had within himself the potentialities of immortal achievement. He had command of a clear, beautiful, eloquent style, which flashed with color and quivered with life. He knew the beauty of English landscapes and the charm of European cities and could convey them with unforgettable pictorial grace to his readers. He had insights into human nature which were always deep and occasionally clairvoyant. At his best, as in "Sons and Lovers," he revealed at a comparatively early age all the powers of noble authorship. But he was obsessed with sex. It followed him as though it were a kind of demonic possession. He could apparently think of little else but the sheer animal aspects of sexual relationships between male and female. More and more, as time went on, his novels became saturated with this sex absorption. It overflowed into his poetry, and produced the unreadable tortoise poems. It inundated his paintings, so that they must be turned to the wall for sheer decency's sake. At last there came "Lady Chatterley's Lover," the last product of Lawrence's pen, the perfect distillation of his perverted spirit—the most filthy book we have ever read, and we beg to believe the vilest piece of obscenity ever printed on a press. We are not aware, we may say, of any undue squeamishness on this subject. We insist we are no prude. But we also insist that there are really some other things in the world to think and talk about occasionally besides sex, and that men and women are not merely sex mechanisms living for nothing but animal intercourse. We object, in other words, to having the whole of life interpreted as a phallic image. What we see in Lawrence's writings is art despoiled by the frustrations of a defeated soul. What we feel in Lawrence is a man tortured by the timeless agonies of sex impotence.

Can Religion Survive Without the Church?

This is in continuance of the discussion inaugurated last June with an article entitled, "Why the Church?" and succeeded from time to time by editorial articles and by letters published in the correspondence columns. It need scarcely be reiterated here that such correspondence is always welcomed.

Apropos of our question one correspondent declares that the "thesis that religion will survive despite the abandonment of ecclesiastical organization . . . is, to my way of thinking, a Utopian dream." This correspondent's "way of thinking" is further revealed by the following:

> I conceive a day when the Churches will be no longer needed, but that day is a dim, far off divine event. There will come a time, I suppose, when universities will be abandoned, because the race will be completely educated, and the funded stores of knowledge will be entirely full. But that day is so far removed from our present experience that it is extremely difficult to visualize it. For millions of years we shall need Churches, and Churches of massive strength, just as we shall need scholars and schools of learning.

Such thinking as this, doubtless widely diffused, probably supports, at least in reputedly liberal circles, the present ecclesiastical order. The analysis of such thinking will reveal in some degree the insecurity of the ecclesiastical system. How far will modern educators accept the comparison instituted between the churches and the universities? What will they think of the conception of the function of universities implicit in it? The universities are to be abandoned when "the funded stores of knowledge shall be entirely full." It is not unreasonable to set the date for that event several millions of years hence! Will not educators, indeed, resent being set at any time at this tank-filling task? Their mission is to train thinkers and doers, not to cram human storage with knowledge.

A similar perversion of ideas commonly supports the ecclesiastical system in religion. Religion is esteemed to be a kind of thing which can be stored up like the knowledge assumed to be impounded at the universities. Religion can be manufactured in its

turn by churches. Both in education and in religion the times call for an eradication of this fallacy.

The universities are functionaries to which has been assigned a definite task conceived to be necessary and desirable in the service of a particular group or segment of the population. This is as far as the conception runs even in the minds of many educators. Education esteemed as the development of life purposes and life technique is now being recognized by enlightened educators as demanding a greatly extended program if not a radically different technique from that conventionally employed in our educational institutions. More effective methods of serving the young are being sought. But more important is the need of objectives and technique not yet developed in adult education. The backwardness of this branch of the educational function is being more and more clearly recognized everywhere today. Our correspondent selected an analogy which proves more apt than he imagines. The university which he visualized is doomed to go the way of the church which he, with considerable complacency, accepts as a permanent factor in society.

In finding a reply to our inquiry, it is both unnecessary and confusing to hark back to conditions and achievements of the past. It may not be true, as Henry Ford is reputed to have remarked in an unguarded moment, that history is "bunk," but it is clear that a buttressing of decadent social institutions by an appeal to their alleged glories and achievements in the past is often a lamentable social dis-service. Neither the church of the first century nor that of medieval Europe is desirable in American society today. To insist upon maintaining either of them, or the present institution because alleged to be a lineal descendant of either, must surely be esteemed a confession of blindness. We are living in a democracy. A religion as broad and irenic and far-reaching as democracy is a vital necessity. A religion which is conceived as the boon of a select few "called out" of the mass of the population is essentially vicious in the American democracy of today, whatever may be claimed for its achievements in the past. Nor more acceptable can be a self-directed institution which assumes to lay down the law to freemen even though the assumption is alleged to be under divine sanction.

Is it not reasonable, therefore, to conclude that, so far from religion needing the church for its survival, it must appear that on the contrary religion cannot survive with the church, the church being what it is today and what it must continue to be by the very virtue of its own conceptions of itself and of its mission, and religion being what it must be as a measure of valuations in a democracy?

The same correspondent challenges the assertion that the American church is in decay. Churches are not decadent, states he. On the contrary they thrive. They are growing in numbers, in wealth, and, he believes, also, in influence. They know their mission, their mission is sound and covers the requirements, and they are with measurable satisfaction succeeding at it. If this is true our question becomes purely academic and speculative. If the churches are the recognized depositories of religion, and are proving adequate to their mission, there is little profit in discussing the effect upon religion of their decay and eventual disappearance.

Our question assumes that the decay of the church and its waning influence are recognized. It further assumes a degree of concern for religion in view of their condition. Those who feel no such concern are naturally not interested. Among the unconcerned are those who are satisfied with the religion mediated by the churches and who are also satisfied with the manner in which the churches function. Among them also are those who care nothing for religion nor for the churches as its media of expression. Whether religion will survive the decay of the churches is a question of no importance to them; they rather hope that it will not.

There remains, however, many who believe that they witness a decay of the American church which cannot be concealed by padded rolls nor by increasing wealth and "benevolence." In the final issue they really do not care what happens to the churches, but they do very much care what becomes of religion. They see in the church merely an institution, the implement of a purpose, good or bad, efficient or futile, to be retained or discarded according as it fulfills the purpose or does not do so. If the church is found to be misrepresenting religion, inculcating purposes and ideals foreign or antagonistic to religion, the demonstration of the "success" of the church will be the more to be deplored than its failure. In that case the church will the more fail that it seems to succeed.

All our discussion finally drives back, of course, to our definition of religion. If religion is the fiat of an omnipotent diety, then a church which can demonstrate that it is the sole and qualified vicegerent of that diety on earth is essential to religion; religion goes with the church's passing. If religion is a manufactured article, then the factory and the storehouse which turns it out and store it are essential, and religion is destroyed when the factory collapses or the machinery breaks down. But if religion is an impulse, a vital force which energizes a society and if that society is a democratic commonwealth, then a church which is a persistent divisive force in the community, which exacts tests which are anti-social, which obscures or opposes the functions which make for the spiritual health of the community, such a church is not essential to religion, but religion is likely to thrive and take on a new vitality with the disappearance of the church, rather than be jeopardized or destroyed. After all is said, each will answer our question after he has con-

structed and thought through to a satisfying issue his definition of religion.

Those of us who define religion in something like the terms used in the third alternative above feel the more enthusiastic for the future of religion, now that the essential and inherent incapacity of the church of today is being recognized. Religion is vital. The society we are trying to build must look to religion for vitalization, the shaping and clarification of its ideals. Its ideals and the institutions now presuming to mediate religion are in irreconcilable clash. Because religion is so essential we must conclude that churches, the ecclesiastical order, must give place in our American democracy.

But can religion, the religion desiderated or any element or expression of religion, survive without embodiment in institutional form? Yes, it can survive its emancipation from the trammels of a particular institution. It can survive in our society only as it does escape such trammels. No, it cannot survive, except as it expresses itself institutionally in all of the organized life of a democratic society. Released from its ecclesiastical bondage it will thus survive. Those who share the faith in religion here expressed find it so vital that it must spread among all institutions of the community. There we come again to the conclusion reached in the last preceding article in this series: What is needed today is the functional instead of the ecclesiastical organization of religion. The former is essentially and efficiently democratic, and fits into a democratic commonwealth. The latter is essentially inimical to democracy, and a democratic society which centers its religious hopes in an ecclesiastical order is a house divided against itself. It can save itself from falling only by centering its hopes elsewhere and otherwise.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

On page 3 of the March 3rd issue of UNITY, we are made to say that "the treaty under which we govern Haiti expires in 1930." It should be 1936!

"The Church Still Lives," Dr. Trexler Finds"—headline in the New York *Times,* March 3rd, page 29. Yes, Doctor, the church still lives. Signs of life can be detected. But do such feeble signs mean life, or imminent death? Ask any physician who has sat watching by a bedside in the last hours.

The great Coolidge Dam in Arizona is aptly named. A Roosevelt Dam always seemed to us a misnomer, but not a Coolidge Dam. For Coolidge can be counted upon to stop anything—talk, action, progress, why not water?

It is reported that the "drys" are preparing to bring to this country for exhibition purposes a 156-year old Turk, who has buried eleven wives and "never took a drink in his life." Perhaps if he had taken a drink just once, he might have died and thus saved the lives of a few women. What kind of an argument for Prohibition is this?

The late Dr. Henry Mottet, Rector of the Church of the Holy Communion, New York City, left an estate valued *in toto* at $1,276. This included an estimate of $614 on his library and $100 as the appraised value of an overcoat. All this sounds as though Dr. Mottet was something of a Christian.

We have always cherished doubts as to whether France were really a democracy. When we read, however, that in the vote which overthrew the short-lived ministry of Mr. Chautemps, over 1,000 ballots were cast by only 600 Deputies, all doubts were removed. In ballot-stuffing of this kind, France lived up to the best democratic traditions.

J. H. H.

The Plumbline of Justice

(After John Peter Altgeld)

When man erects a mansion straight and strong
The soaring pendulum swings to and fro,
But towards the changeless center of the earth
It moves unerring in the depths below.

When God o'er men and nations sets the line,
The good may seem by evil overcast,
But towards the universal throne of God,
Eternal justice gravitates at last.

Be not discouraged. Life will right itself;
Through mansions crumble, nations cease to stand,
God's plumbline is His justice ever-sure,
And righteousness the plummet in His hand.

LOUIS I. NEWMAN.

The Sacred Ganges

A swami sits beside the mighty stream
And sees the whirling bubbles floating by
As forms of human life that vainly try
To be the substance of the things they seem.
One passing moment and a fitful gleam
Illuminates the surface, then the sky
Looks down with placid eyes which see them die
As though all life were a delusive dream.

So human bubbles form and go their way
But how or whence or whither no man knows
Nor if their fate is ever to be free.
The mighty stream, meanwhile, with no delay
And with a steady current onward flows
From changing time into eternity.

WILLIAM WARE LOCKE.

Bertrand Russell and Some New Ideas of Marriage

Bertrand Russell and his novel ideas of relations between the sexes in general, and of marriage in particular, have now been before the country long enough for judgment to assert itself. It is easy, of course, for such judgment to dismiss Mr. Russell's ideas as a mere restatement of the out-moded doctrine of "free love." But Bertrand Russell is not a man to be lightly scorned. He is an able and honest thinker, and exercises a large influence in our time. He must be understood, and soberly considered.

As presented in his book, "Marriage and Morals," Mr. Russell's solution of the sex problem involves three very simple propositions:

In the first place, he advocates free relations between men and women who have no thought of or desire for children. He would have young people, for example, who are not in an economic position to raise a family, but who are well and strong and hungry for happiness, feel perfectly free to live together; and he would have them given the information about birth control which will enable them to do this with a sense of security. He would have such relations perfectly open and above board, for secrecy in this relation, as in every human relation, is subversive of frankness, honesty and joy. To this end he would remove all legal disabilities and penalties from such relation, and have society establish new conventions and customs which will protect the relation as now it outlaws and condemns it. If the partners to such a relation desire soon or late, for reasons satisfactory to themselves, to get married, Mr. Russell would permit them to do so. But he would have "no marriage legally binding until the wife's first pregnancy. . . . Children, rather than sexual intercourse," he declares, "are the true purpose of marriage, which should therefore be not regarded as consummated until such time as there is a prospect of children."

This brings us to the second of Bertrand Russell's propositions. This is that marriage should be joined and maintained wherever the sex relation has resulted in children. Mr. Russell is as rigorous at this point as any of our more Puritanical moralists. Marriage, it must be remembered, is from Bertrand Russell's point of view "not primarily a sexual partnership" at all. This sexual partnership, as we have just been seeing, is to be joined outside and not inside the law, and is to be kept empty of children. But marriage has to do with children. That is what it is created for by the laws of the state and the convictions of men—to protect a man and woman in the momentous cooperative task of bearing and rearing children. When two persons have consciously assumed, or unconsciously tumbled into, this great responsibility, they are entitled to the protection of society, and in return must give to society the service of their lives. They must recognize, for example, that the children have claims upon the devotion of their parents which are altogether superior to the claims of the parents upon themselves. When men and women, in other words, become parents, they must subordinate their sexual desires to their parental duties. "This may involve," says Mr. Russell, "very considerable self-repression." But the parents must not object. In particular must divorce be made difficult rather than easy. Mr. Russell is horrified at the easy divorce practices of the United States, and insists upon regarding this "as a transitional stage" of social development. Marriage, as an institution for the proper bearing and rearing of children, is serious business. Mr. Russell actually goes so far as to state that there are "strong reasons why custom should be against divorce, except in somewhat extreme cases."

Free relations for the childless, rigorous marital relations for parents—these are the first two items in Mr. Russell's program. Now he combines these two, so to speak, in a third proposition which declares that, while marriage must be maintained in the case of children, it should "not" be made to "exclude other sex relations." Mr. Russell would have husbands and wives entirely free to enjoy such sex experience outside of marriage, with persons other than their marital partners, as is not inconsistent with their duties to their children and each other. He would do away, in other words, with the whole concept of adultery. "Adultery in itself," he says, "should not be a ground for divorce." It is altogether unlikely that any married person can go through life "without occasionally having strong impulses to adultery." To indulge such impulses on occasion, says Mr. Russell, does not "necessarily imply that the marriage no longer serves its purposes." It need not even disturb an ardent and true affection between husband and wife, if the husband and wife are properly educated and trained. What it does is to destroy that "restrictive morality" which holds people unwholesomely in check, like a policeman, and thus "diminishes receptivity and sympathy and the opportunities of valuable human contacts." Mr. Russell protests his belief in marriage. "It is the best and most important relation," he says, "that can exist between two human beings." But if marriage is to be truly successful, "husbands and wives must learn to understand that, whatever the law may say, in their private lives they must be free."

In these three propositions is Bertrand Russell's answer to the sex question. It may all be summed up, it seems to me, in the single proposition that the sex life between men and women shall be lived in terms of freedom, save as it may be modified and restricted in the interest of children. This is a suggestion so revolutionary, so unwelcome in its implications to many minds, that it is difficult to view it without prejudice to Mr. Russell. It is important, however, to be fair, and therefore to consider some of the reasons why this enlightened man is persuaded to resort to remedies which seem to be so desperate.

At bottom is a profound dissatisfaction with marriage as it exists today, and a knowledge of the causes that are operating to break down this ancient institution. No man is more sensitive than Bertrand Russell to the forces that are at large in the modern world, and the changes these forces are producing in the lives of individuals and the processes of society. Marriage is disintegrating under the impact of these forces. Believing in marriage, at least as a nursery of childhood, Mr. Russell would seek to determine what adjustments are necessary to save it from dissolution. In this he is like every other enlightened man. No one of us believes that marriage is going to survive unchanged into the future. But Mr. Russell suggests changes which are unusual. He would save marriage by remedies so drastic as to seem destructive. What are the reasons for such remedies? Why does he suggest these and not

some others? As I look through this book, I seem to find him presenting three reasons for his ideas.

The first reason is to be found in what Mr. Russell regards as a *fact*—namely, the polygamous nature of civilized human beings. It has been common in the past to refer specifically to men as polygamous, and to assert that women are single and exclusive in their sex devotion. But Mr. Russell insists that, at least under conditions of civilization, women as well as men are instinctively polygamous. "They may fall deeply in love," is his opinion, "and be for some years entirely absorbed in one person, but sooner or later sexual familiarity dulls the edge of passion, and then they begin to look elsewhere for a revival of the old thrill." It is possible, of course, to control this impulse, though Mr. Russell is tempted to emphasize the difficulty of so doing, and the ill effects which follow upon the repressions thus induced. But the impulse is there, whether we control it or not, and assuredly it is the part of wisdom to act accordingly. The trouble with marriage is that sex relations have been persistently organized upon an artificial basis of monogamy dictated by the superstitions of the church, the possessive instincts of the male, and the property interests of society. Now the time has come to sweep away this unnatural straight-jacket, and organize the sex relation upon the basis of reality, which is the instinct of the race to be polygamous.

The second reason for Bertrand Russell's point of view is to be found not in a fact but in a *principle*—namely, the principle of freedom. Mr. Russell is something of a fanatic on the subject of personal liberty. Much more of an Anarchist than a Socialist in his fundamental philosophy, he believes that the state should not intrude upon the private life of the individual except under conditions which involve the very life of society itself. Such conditions, he holds, do not inhere in the sex life of men and women unless children are involved. Sex relations are by their very nature, he contends, "a purely private affair." "If a man and a woman choose to live together without having children," says Mr. Russell, "that should be no one's business but their own." Freedom is a sound principle in any relation of life. It is not only sound but absolute in the case of a relation between individuals so necessarily intimate and personal as this of which we are speaking.

But freedom is not merely an end in itself—an inalienable right to which men and women are properly entitled. It is also a means to a higher end which constitutes the third reason for Bertrand Russell's libertarian attitude toward the question of sex. What really dominates Mr. Russell's thoughts upon this question is his *dream* of the ideal relation which is some day going to exist between men and women in their love for one another. This ideal relation, he says, does not exist today, and will never exist in the future, under the close-bound conditions of marriage which now prevail. Love does not flourish between two partners who are exclusively and permanently bound to one another by the authority of the law. "Love can flourish only as long as it is free and spontaneous; it tends to be killed by the thought that it is a duty. To say that it is your duty to love so-and-so is the surest way to cause you to hate him or her." The trouble with marriage is that it does with husbands and wives the same thing that the law does with criminals—it shuts them up in a prison, and thus denies them all contact with the outer world. The result is the same in one case as in the other—the impoverishment and embitterment of human life. Instead of becoming the breeding-place of love and tenderness and compassion, marriage becomes a hotbed of jealousy and "wrath and anger and clamor and evil-speaking." All the evils which St. Paul in his worst moments could find within the human heart, flourish abundantly, says Mr. Russell, in the state of matrimony. It is for this reason that he rebels against it. He dreams of a married life which is beautiful and rich. He thinks of the sex relation in terms of a love which is ever ardent because it is ever fresh. All that romance has ever craved, he would abundantly satisfy. And he declares that this can be done only by multiplying human contacts, and thus opening wide "all the approaches of love."

It is for reasons such as these that Bertrand Russell commends to us his doctrine of freedom in the sexual relation—the fact (as he calls it) of the polygamous instincts of human nature, the principle of individual liberty as the basis of conduct, and the dream of a married life redeemed and purified of the ills, which now beset it. So closely is Mr. Russell's program interwoven with the reasons with which he attempts to justify it, that it is impossible to consider the one without the other. We must estimate the value of Mr. Russell's philosophy, in other words, if we are to test the validity of his ideas. What are we to say, therefore, about his reasons for free love? What is our reaction upon the propositions which he submits?

First of all there is his assertion about human nature—that "men and women are generally polygamous in their instincts." The thing that most impresses me about this statement is the fact that Mr. Russell very carefully restricts the application of it to "civilized people." He agrees, in other words, and so states in his chapter on "Marriage," that sex relations between the higher animals are "monogamic . . . in particular among the anthropoid apes." He goes on to agree that primitive man also lives a monogamic life—that the lowest savages, such as the Bushmen and the Tasmanians, "are invariably faithful to their wives." "Even among civilized men," he says, "faint traces of a monogamic instinct can be perceived." All of which means, it seems to me, that the instincts of human flesh, in the beginnings, at least, when instincts are supposed to take their rise, are not polygamous but monogamous. The line of evolutionary development, if Bertrand Russell be correct, has moved steadily toward the establishment of the single relationship between male and female. As the animals rose in the biological scale, promiscuity gave way to fidelity. When men first appeared upon the scene, their sexual relations were as monogamous as similar relations among the higher apes. As man developed in his social and cultural life, this standard was maintained, and Bertrand Russell is careful to explain, in four or five of the most original and fascinating pages of his book, why this necessarily was so. Then came civilization, and for the first time a reversion to those polygamous tendencies which had not appeared in the line of evolutionary development since the days of the anthropoid apes.

Bertrand Russell declares that this final development means that man, under civilized conditions, is polygamous. Which may be true! But does this

mean, in turn, that human nature is itself inherently polygamous and is thus re-asserting the basic instincts of its being? Or does it mean that civilization is corruptive, and is thus throwing men back into animal habits and indulgences from which for ages they have been trying to escape? All that Bertrand Russell has to say in this connection about the polygamous tendencies of men and women under the influences of civilization is an interpretation, to my mind, not of human nature but of civilization. It is a demonstration of what the ease and wealth and luxury and idleness inherent in every highly developed civilization do to those who are exposed to the influence of these conditions. It is an explanation of why every civilization that has appeared in human history has sooner or later fallen, and why such decline and fall, as in ancient Rome, are invariably accompanied by a break-down of marriage and a spread of laxity in sex relations. Bertrand Russell is not telling us anything about men and women when he declares that "civilized people . . . are generally polygamous in their instincts," but he is telling us a lot about civilization. And he is arguing, quite unawares apparently, that if our civilization is not to go the way of every other civilization which has preceded it, this polygamous instinct must be corrected and controlled.

Second, in Bertrand Russell's argument, is his principle of freedom. Society has no right, he says, to intrude upon relations between men and women which, from their very nature are private and personal. This is a contention which appeals to us all, for the principle of freedom is in our blood. But Bertrand Russell makes his contention of practically none effect by conceding that, where children are the fruit of the sex relation, society has not only the right but a duty to interfere. In this matter of children, as we have seen, Mr. Russell is much more rigorous than most of the moralists of our time. He is opposed to divorce between husbands and wives who have assumed the august responsibility of bearing and rearing children. He can concede only two grounds for divorce in this circumstance—an incurable defect in one of the partners, such as insanity or dipsomania, or an incompatibility between the parents of such a furious intensity that preservation of the home brings more damage than benefit to the children. Apart from conditions such as these, Mr. Russell would have the partners stay together, no matter what the degree of sacrifice for themselves. The whole burden of his argument is to the effect that, where children are involved, the sex love of the individual must be subordinated to the demands of the offspring.

But if interference by society is justified in one case, why not in other cases, if good reason can be offered? There are some of us who believe that the interests of children demand that the marriage of the parents should be protected not only from divorce, as Mr. Russell contends, but also from extra-marital relations of any kind. Walter Lippmann, for example, argues that if parents do not prevent each other from sexual experiences outside of marriage, it is impossible for them to cooperate adequately in the education of their children. "Mates who are not lovers," says Mr. Lippmann, "will not cooperate in bearing children; they will be distracted, insufficient, and, worst of all, they will be merely dutiful." Therefore does he believe that, in the interests of the children, it is the business of society to protect the family from adulterous relations of any kind. There are some of us who would go further, and argue that, even when there are no children, society is still concerned with sex relations between men and women. We are not so sure, for example, that contraceptive devices are so infallible as to guarantee sterility. Any union of man and woman may involve offspring, and therefore is the state potentially concerned whenever man and woman enter upon this intimate relation. But even if children are out of the picture altogether, there are some of us who would still contend that the sexual relation is essentially social and not personal at all. For love is a dynamic and explosive force. It has consequences of fearful import not only to the individuals concerned but also to all the relations, social and otherwise, in which these individuals may be involved. Mr. Russell himself concedes—I quote his very words—that "love is an anarchic force, which, *if it is left free,* will not remain within any bounds set by law or custom." It is just for this reason that many of us believe, and society has always insisted, that love should not be "left free," but should be controlled, like any other wild, anarchic force, in the interest of the welfare and safety of us all. The point I am trying to make is that Bertrand Russell lays down no absolute rule of individual liberty. He himself agrees that in that part of the sex relation which is primary in its influence—namely, the production of children—the demands and wishes of the individual must be sacrificed to the interests of the state. But it is not so clear that the interests of the state do not carry far beyond the production of the children to that more intimate function of the sex relation which we call love. For love is essentially lawless, violent, selfish, anti-social. In my own humble opinion, if society is to survive at all, it must control this function, and Bertrand Russell himself gives us the justification for our plea.

But what about Mr. Russell's dream of a richer and more beautiful life, in which love will flourish without restraint, and men and women be freed from the jealousies and hatreds, the embitterments and hostilities, which now plague them like a pestilence? It is a lovely dream! But where does Mr. Russell get his assurance that free relations between men and women will suddenly cure them of all those ills of human nature which have been from the beginning of the world? In relations of every kind between men and women, we find the petty mind, the selfish heart, the jealous spirit. It makes no difference whether it is in business or society, in the church or the school, we always encounter these cantankerous elements of human nature which make co-operative relations between men so difficult and precarious. It is not surprising that such elements of weakness and wickedness also enter into marriage. But in free love, Mr. Russell contends, they will immediately disappear. All you have got to do is to end the marriage bond, and the petty mind will become large with understanding, the selfish heart will become generous and forgiving, the jealous spirit will become full of the milk of human kindness. Personally, I don't believe it. This may be true in heaven, and incidentally this may be the reason why Jesus said that in heaven men and women neither marry, nor are given in marriage. But it is not true, and will not be true in any measurable time, upon the earth. In other words, men and women will be just as mean and spiteful and jealous and ugly —if they are that kind of people—in the free relation

as in the married relation. Indeed, I would even go so far as to suggest that they will be worse rather than better. I never hear anybody arguing, as Mr. Russell argues, about free love—so innocent, so naive, so unsophisticated in his ideas—but what I feel like inviting him to read Brieux's great drama upon this subject. In this play we are shown the experience of a man who stepped outside of marriage for the sake of the blessedness in sex relations which freedom alone would give him. He tried the experiment, only to find that for every one devil of envy and discord in the marriage relation, there were seven devils of envy and discord in the free relation. Say what you will, so long as men are men, and women women, free love will be not a whit easier than marriage.

It is this simple and obvious fact, that the dream of free love as contrasted with marriage is a delusion and a snare, which brings me to a point which I would strongly emphasize. I want to object, in Mr. Russell's discussion of marriage and morals, to the viewpoints from which he speaks—which are not only unsound, but also unfair. These viewpoints, which vitiate his whole argument, are two in number:

On the one hand, he takes free love at its very best. He presents it to us as invariably consisting of two persons living together in an idyllic relation of happiness and peace. But where are these such persons, and where is there such a relation? My experience may not be as wide as that of Mr. Russell, especially in the field of free love. But I have had my contacts through the years with persons who have lived together in freedom, as well as with persons who have lived together in marriage. And my testimony is twofold: first, that the free love relation shares all the disabilities and degradations and tragedies that marriage, even at its worst, has ever known; and secondly, that just to the extent the free love relation brings happiness and content, the partners sooner or later are eager to consummate it in marriage.

On the other hand, as Mr. Russell's first viewpoint is always free love at its best, so his second viewpoint is always marriage at its worst. Invariably he presents us this relation as a condition of jealousy and friction, discord and dissension. Now there are such marriages in the world—all too many of them. They differ from free love relations of a similar type only in the fact that the sordid details of the ignoble marriage are spread upon the records for the inspection and instruction of the public, whereas the sordid details of a free love relation which has gone wrong are hidden away in the heart of a disillusioned man and a broken-hearted woman, or in the sealed confessional of a minister or a physician. But there are other kinds of marriages—marriages which have realized beauty, reflected love, and created peace. And I contend that it is only fair that we should consider these marriages as our standard when we are asking whether marriage or free-love is the solution of our problem. I do not want to be personal, but I have to confess that I am never able to read Mr. Russell upon marriage without remembering that he is speaking from his own disastrous failure in this relation. What is his testimony but a rationalization of his own experience? Infinitely more cogent, and more important, to my mind, is the testimony of one who has succeeded in the marriage relation, and thus knows its possibilities of happiness and honor. It is in this sense that I count one line of poetry from Robert Browning on this question as outweighing all that Mr. Russell has written in a book of over three hundred pages. "Only those who have mastered the art know aught of the beauty."

When free love and marriage are thus contrasted on the basis of the standard of the best that may be in each, the advantage is all with marriage. Bertrand Russell himself seems to recognize this fact, however unwillingly. To my mind there is a certain pathos about his book, a wistfulness as of one who knows that he has lost the true way, and would fain get back again. In his own best moments, when he sees most deeply and feels most clearly, he recognizes marriage to be the one sane and beneficent solution of the sex problem. Listen to the words of Bertrand Russell, the advocate of freedom.

> A marriage which begins with passionate love and leads to children who are desired and loved, ought to produce so deep a tie between a man and a woman that they will feel something infinitely precious in their companionship, even after sexual passion has decayed . . . A companionship which has lasted for many years, and through many deeply felt events, has a richness of content, which cannot belong to the first days of love, however delightful these may be. And any person who appreciates what time can do to enhance values, will not lightly throw away such companionship for the sake of a new love.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Russia to Cut Down on Alcohol and Babies

On only two articles does Russia's famous five-year plan contemplate a reduction—vodka and babies! On everything else there is to be a sharp increase; steel, electrical productions, cotton goods, wheat, all are to shoot up rapidly, some doubling and tripling during these five years. But the two commodities for whose production—and consumption—prewar Russia was most famous—booze and children—are to be cut in quantity.

"Children are the flowers of life" is the Russian attitude, a slogan constantly quoted. Yes, but not too many of them. The Russian birth rate has been for decades more than twice that of Scandinavia and Anglo-Saxon lands and one and a half times that of Central Europe. Her babies come now at the annual rate of 44 per thousand population, and since the vast increase of health measures, has almost halved her infant death rate and lessened adult death rate also, her actual net increase of population is over 23 per thousand, which is 50 per cent higher than prewar. May there not be too swift increase of babies?

It is somewhat breath-taking to find this delicate question, whose mere approach gives rise in other lands to raids and court cases, handled with such a cheery matter-of-factness by a government Health Department. On a large chart in the Exhibition of Motherhood and Infancy, permanently displayed by the Health authorities of the whole country, one reads the "five-year plan" for care of babies. A thousand mothers' consultations in place of 447; a doubling of maternity beds in hospitals, and of consultations for expectant mothers; almost a doubling of budget and of day nurseries. And then, in large unmistakable figures: "Birth rate, 1928, 44 per 1,000; 1933, 40 per 1,000."

Seventeen birth-control clinics, already established in Moscow are part of the answer to the question how this expected drop is to happen. Mothers' consultations all over the country, according to a prominent health worker, are expected to give information on this subject whenever asked but are not usually equipped with supplies. The seventeen new clinics not only give supplies but make scientific studies into methods. A notable increase in the variety and quantity of equipment purchased in drug stores, has also been part of the plan for the past two years.

Thus casually the Bolsheviks again break in revolutionary manner through age-old prohibitions. It has, however, not always been so, even since the revolution. A certain asceticism in Lenin, plus aversion to those "Bourgeois birth-controllers" who claimed to improve the lot of the working-class by other means than socialism, caused the idea to be frowned upon. Socialism will take care of an indefinite number of babies, it was said. Have we not all the plains of Siberia?

The first demand of women, however, was means to decrease the number of babies. Peasant women in the far wilds of Siberia, confessed to women physicians that they had had nineteen and twenty births, and were "ashamed to admit it." "It is our backwardness" they said. "We hear that in America they have families as small as four or five. Why doesn't our government help us?"

Under this pressure the ban was early removed against that serious operation which is everywhere else in the world declared criminal; it was performed no longer clandestinely, but in state hospitals with the result that its attendant death rate dropped enormously and became quite insignificant. None the less, its injury to the national health was undoubted, and doctors' congresses soon began to demand the spread of earlier, preventive measures. This also became not only legal, but was done through clinics maintained by Departments of Health.

Russia looks at Holland, where two decades of similar clinics have helped increase the health of the population, without interfering with its natural and desired increase. After five years of the plan now starting in Russia, the rate of population increase is still expected to be larger than ever. The birth rate may fall, indeed, from 44 to 40 (still twice as high as in most civilized countries) but the death rate of babies is expected to fall. So the population increase will remain at its present phenomenal height or even more so.

The cut in booze—that other product which is to diminish during the five-year plan, is the result of the work of the Society for Fighting Alcohol, whose methods are educational combined with small amounts of administrative pressure. Among the leaders of Russia's government today, there has always been a strong group anxious for complete prohibition, and this was actually put into effect during the civil war, with little opposition.

While effective in the cities, the result of prohibition in the rural districts was to stimulate the home-brewing of a vile decoction known as "samagon," very wasteful of grain and poisonous to health. Its production expanded rapidly at the cost of the expanding wheat harvests; and Russia lacked the money to enforce, even partly, prohibition over so great an area. Why not permit vodka, and make it increase government revenues instead of wasting the grain?

State-manufactured vodka was again introduced against very strong protests. Once started, its consumption grew by geometric progressions, more than doubling every year, till it reached 529 million liters, or nearly four liters for every man, woman and child. Even this was only half the consumption in tsarist days and statistics showed that it was clearly increasing at the expense of the vile tasting samagon. None the less, Russians grew alarmed and formed the Society for Fighting Alcohol, a year and a half ago.

During the first year of their agitation, the total consumption of vodka increased slightly throughout the country, but in the twelve cities where they centered attention, it was cut by varying amounts from 15 percent to 41. Agitation, education and organization of children and workers against it were the means used, especially effective in Russia where a resolution passed by factory-workers always commands attention at the city hall.

It became a recognized duty of Young Pioneers in factories, to make lists of the men applying to the factory clinic for a day off, and then follow up those men to see if they went home to bed or to the nearest drink hall. In the latter case, their names were shamefully posted in the factory wall-newspaper. At every parade for more than a year, anti-alcohol placards have figured widely. And as all Russia became infatuated with the Five-Year Plan of production, attention was called to the injury to production by drunkenness.

Workers' mass-meetings in factories voted against the sale of vodka "within such a distance of our factory." When such resolutions reached the city authorities, they were practically bound to accept them at once or face a charge of hampering production. Similarly, school-meetings passed resolutions in which the children demanded that no vodka should be sold near their school; these also were mandatory on the city. It was by such means that the twelve industrial cities cut down on vodka.

In the textile town of Ivanovo, for instance, which I have just visited, the first quarter of the year showed a reduction of only 7 per cent over the previous year, putting them at the bottom of the list of cities, as far as curtailment of vodka was concerned. When this fact was published, it aroused the Ivanovo workers to such efforts, that during the second quarter they cut consumption by 50 per cent over the corresponding period of the previous year. In fact; the city fathers of Ivanovo were faced by serious budget difficulties, for they had counted on the revenue from licensed drink. They attempted to stem the tide, and to make the reduction more gradual; but delegations from the factories stormed the city hall and forced them to accept the change.

When Russia was making her Five-Year Plan, and the State Spirit Trust was blandly proposing a steady increase in vodka made and revenues resulting, the Society for Fighting Alcohol broke into the discussion with demands that the plan for vodka be lowered instead of raised. They were required to show what methods they would use to curtail demand, so that vodka would not be replaced by home-brew samagon. They showed them. As a result they carried their point, and the plan for state-made vodka was reduced by even more than the society demanded.

Russia which produced last year 529 million liters of vodka, expects to produce at the end of five years

only 369 million. The main drop will be made in the cities, where organized agitation is more effective, and where the cessation of vodka is not apt to lead to the viler home-brew. In towns the present consumption of 178 million liters will be cut to 80 million, or more than half. Some time in the distant future the Society envisages complete prohibition, but not, they inform me, until widespread education brings this demand from the people in every district. They have no desire to acquire America's present problems. "We shall be content" they say, "with a gradual approximation towards prohibition consonant with the growing awakening of our people."

ANNA LOUISE STRONG.

The Study Table

Exotics

At one time and another, between 1922 and 1928, Miss Beckwith has published Jamaican folklore. Her papers have appeared in various journals and in the publications of the Vassar College Folklore Foundation. Some of these have already been noticed in UNITY. Her exhaustive work, "Jamaica Folklore" was published last year (1928) as a Memoir of the American Folklore Society. The book before us is less technical and is aimed at a more general audience.[1] The subordinate title, *Study of Folk Life in Jamaica,* fairly indicates its character. Our author covers the entire field. She not only gives us her own studies and investigations; she draws upon the work of previous writers, either to fill out a subject or to institute comparisons. The negroes of Jamaica are a conservative people. They have been left largely to their own devices and ways, with a minimum of interference and control by whites or government. They are a simple, not unfriendly, folk. For the most part they are "small settlers," having their little pieces of ground and their rude and simple homes. Fishing and trapping exist but play a relatively small part; domestic animals are few—a dog, a donkey, a goat, perhaps a hog. The people are traders, of course, and the market is a significant thing in their lives. Miss Beckwith traces the individual from birth to death. She examines their daily occupations, their amusements, their beliefs, their religious practices, their art. It is all interesting and all done with thoroughness, sympathy and affection. Among the more interesting studies are those of the John Canoe dance, *obeah* (witchcraft or magic), *myal* men and their revivalists. Studies of obeah or magic among negroes in various parts of America are fairly well known; less studied are the myal men. Miss Beckwith believes that myalism came from Africa. Myal men claim the power of removing obeah spells. As members of a secret society they claim to be invulnerable to weapons and to have power to raise the dead. The latter claim is regularly found in African secret societies, where death and restoration to life occur in the initiation ceremonies. The initiate is born again, takes a new name, is a new creature. It is interesting to find here the same superstitions and practices connected with the cottontree that are everywhere in West Africa. To me the most interesting chapter in the book is the one that deals with revivalism, a new form of combatting obeah. The revivalists have added Christian elements to their pagan practices. Usually attributed to the religious enthusiasm of 1860, our author is inclined to go further back and to find much that is truly native in their practices. She has been an attendant at some of their meetings and has interviewed several of the present leaders. These leaders have visions, claim prophetic powers and practice healing. Famous among them was Bedward, the Shepherd of August Town. He caused great excitement and unrest. He announced his own ascension to heaven for December 31, 1920—when the whites would be destroyed and his people would enter upon a period of millennial blessedness. He proclaimed himself the incarnation of Christ, saying: "I myself am Jesus Christ. I was crucified." When the ascension failed to materialize, he set later dates and kept the people in excitement.

In May he determined to make a public demonstration of his claims. On the march to Kingston, the government seized the opportunity to arrest the leaders for vagrancy, consign Bedward to the insane asylum and disperse the prophet's following.

Bedward however was not the only leader. The movement is still vital and will no doubt continue indefinitely. Miss Beckwith gives references at the end of each chapter and has provided an extended and satisfactory bibliography. The book contains a map, which, not only gives the necessary geographic information, but also shows just where the author has made personal investigations and where new work may still be done.

We confess to disappointment. Not that the title of the book, "The Land of Gods and Earthquakes" sounded promising, but we hoped to find more than we did.[2] Mr. Haring is said to have resided long in Japan and to be able to speak Japanese. So far as the long residence is concerned he seems to have been in Japan for at least two periods, during one of which at least he seems to have been a teacher. His knowledge of the language is certainly astounding! We have known many foreigners who spoke Japanese well; we confess that we have never met one who made himself so well understood to Japanese and to whom, in turn, they made such comprehensible replies. The only thing in our own experience comparable to it is the young mother, who tells with facility just what the baby says —while no bystander could make even a guess at it. Mr. Haring's attitude is sympathetic, though not blindly so. He makes many strange statements. Thus, he tells us that a cicada is for a time "a beetle;" still he frankly admits that he is no entomologist. No doubt there was plenty of liquid refreshment at the time

1. **Black Roadways: A Study of Folk Life in Jamaica.** Martha Warren Beckwith. Chapel Hill: 1929. University of North Carolina Press. 16 mo. pp. xviii 243. Price $3.00.

2. **The Land of Gods and Earthquakes.** Douglas Gilbert Haring. New York: 1929. Columbia University Press. 800 pp. xi (i). 203. Price $3.50.

"when the gods go ariding:" but it is quite certain that the boys in his picture, "the boys bring liquid refreshments" are not doing so. The gods in question by the way go ariding in *mikoshi,* comparable to the Hebrew ark of the covenant. We are told: "Few Japanese houses can withstand such an onslaught from a one- or two-ton *mikoshi.*" It is certain that Mr. Haring would find a real difficulty in showing us a *mikoshi* that weighed anything like a half ton. But—what's the use of being accurate. Mr. Haring touches on a variety of things in Japan and Japanese life. He has no hearty enthusiasms: he half tries, half dislikes, everything. He desires to indulge in pleasantries, rather than in pleasant comments or genuine approbation. He is at his best in the chapter on militarism. At its end he says:

When the Japanese people are assured of safety and equal treatment among the nations, without a military system to argue their case, there is every promise that they will eagerly rid themselves of an army they do not like and a navy which is beyond their pocketbook. At heart they are a peace-loving folk. What would become of Japan without militarism?

A very readable book is James Parker's "The Old Army."[3] It is memories of a military career of more than forty-two years as an army officer, beginning as Second Lieutenant and ending as Major General. He was above all a cavalryman and he was strongest in the directions of drill and training. There have been officers in our army who owed their rapid advancement to some happy accident—to a fortunate marriage, to favorably attracting the attention of a president or of a higher officer in service. Parker was not one of these: he made his way by strict performance of duty. His career was varied. Of his "experience" he says: "I was perhaps the only officer in the army who at the outbreak of the (World) war had commanded in the field a regiment, a brigade, and the equivalent of an army corps." He participated in Indian fighting—specifically against Geronimo and his Apaches—in patrol and protection of the Mexican border, in Cuba, and notably in the Philippine campaign. It is the latter fact that most interested us in his book. Three chapters, 146 pages, are devoted to it. They are an interesting record of conditions and of the special difficulties which were met there. One reason why Parker was not more rapidly advanced was his independence and outspokenness. In this record of Philippine service he says some things that are not likely to endear him to the powers that be. He says that at the time of his arrival:

—all the remaining territory of the islands was in the hands of the insurgents. They had their own government modeled on ours—President, Judiciary, Houses of Congress; their own newspapers, telegraph lines, mail lines, postage stamps, etc.; their own church, for they had expelled the Spanish priests and installed Filipinos in their stead; they had municipal governments and numerous schools. Everywhere they had besieged and captured the Spanish garrisons. In the towns and provinces order reigned; offenses of the most trivial description were promptly punished by due process of law.

Parker's activities were multiform: he participated in a number of actual engagements, but his work of pacification was quite as exacting. Thus, in the District of Lagonoy:

I had to order the marches and combats of troops in which often I took part. I had constantly to inspect my outlying detachments. I supervised the schools, the construction and repair of roads, the civil government of the towns, the civil police, the supervision of spies and former insurgent officers, the confiscation from the insurgent government of hemp and funds, for which I accounted to the civil government at Manila. When famine came I saw that food was brought and the population fed, and I had to gain the people's confidence.

At the end of a discussion of the Filipino question he says:

But enough. Let us get rid of this stain upon our escutcheon. We have held the islands over a quarter of a century. A new generation has grown up under our tutelage. And even this generation is not friendly to us. Things have arrived at a point where no further benefit will accrue by their retention, either to us or to the Filipinos. We have a promise to fulfill. Let us fulfill it.

General Parker would gladly have led his cavalry against the enemy in France. He was not permitted to do so. His services during the great struggle were in the training and preparation of forces here and in inspection on the other side. His retirement for age occurred on February 29, 1928.

A Japanese tells the story; an American woman phrases it; Padraic Colum writes an introduction in which he speaks of its stylized description.[4] The one most to blame seems to be the American word-juggler. We open the book absolutely at random and read:

She returned to the mat; bowed her head again. Another and yet another woman rose and made her prayer. For them Takawo had weary eyes; did not raise his head to look at them. Saw, without seeking, the procession of peasant feet, fat as the bamboo sprout in spring; of bound feet, thin and fragile as the cup of porcelain. Then came at last two smooth golden-colored feet, beautifully boned, rising with elegant economy to the richness of the legs revealed by white trousers snug upon them. Slowly Takawo raised his head, lingered pleasurably over that climbing scrutiny of his eyes; for some moments denied himself the full contour of her body that he might the more carefully observe its gracious architecture; saw the hips smooth, elastic, moving with subtle firmness; touched with his glance the swelling of her breasts; embraced with his eyes the proud smooth column of her neck, cupped with his adoration, a face sweet and recognizable. Nadja walked before him.

And when it was not Nadja, it was some other girl. One after another he happens on them. It seems that he is an exile, though we are never given precise details; and the girls are exiles, one and all. Takawo seems really less an exile than a drifter. He never shows sense or has definite ideas. He is eternally coming to after a vision, or an experience suggestive of dope. He goes farther with some girls than with others—rather far in cases. But ever they are in exile, he and they. There are some 260 pages, all *stylized.* Those who like that kind, may find it to their taste.

We had already written the notice of "Black Roadways," when "The Legend of Kawelo" came to hand.[5] It is number nine of the Publications of the Vassar College Folklore Foundation. Here Miss Beckwith leaves her dear Jamaica and presents us a heretofore unpublished version of a Hawaiian tale. Three versions have already been published. The one now given is interesting for its archaic words and some of its riddling chants. It contains the story of the birth of the hero which is lacking in the others, and which in florid style and with historical anachronisms appears to be a relatively late composition. The Kawelo family ruled the island of Kawai through a long and brilliant period. It was the hero of this story who made the conquest and established the dynasty. The Hawaiian text is printed in full, on alternate pages, with the English translation, made by Laura C. Green, opposite. Miss Beckwith has done the editing. Footnotes identify the animals and plants mentioned in the story, explain difficulties and give information of the daily life. The work has been carefully done and evidences appreciative scholarship.

FREDERICK STARR.

3. **The Old Army.** James Parker. Philadelphia: 1929. Dorrance and Co. 16 mo. pp. 454. Price $4.00.

4. **The Golden Wind.** Takashi Ohta and Margaret Sperry. New York: 1929. Charles Boni. 16 mo. pp. 269. Price $0.50.

5. **The Legend of Kawelo.** Translated from a Hawaiian text by Laura C. Green; edited by Martha Warren Beckwith. Poughkeepsie: 1929. Vassar College. 8 vo. pp. 111.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

BUSINESS PROSPERITY

Respectively Dedicated to Secretary of Labor Davis

[From the New York *Times*, Feb. 18]

In the basement of the Salvation Army Bowery Hotel the other day I saw four young men stripped to their waists. They had taken off their shirts and were washing them in tubs, for they had but one shirt apiece and a clean shirt helps in getting a job. "By night this laundry will be packed," Colonel Winchel told me, "for about 200 wash their clothes here every day. They are not hoboes. You'll be surprised at the number of new faces here now. Some are musicians, actors and clerks, but we don't see much of the white-collar crowd. We get young workmen, more each week, and not only from New York but textile workers from New England, coal miners from Pennsylvania, and steel workers. They come in crowds, for they'd rather take a chance in a big city than starve in a small town, they say, 'It's the worst winter since 1921.' The Municipal Lodging House is overcrowded and is sending 300 a night to bunks on an old East River barge. We have beds for over 600 here and have been giving meal tickets to about 500 a day and throughout New York we help thousands more to get beds, meals, jobs or transportation home. For a little under $1 a day we can give a man meals and a bed, but we've just had word from headquarters uptown that they can send no more meal tickets down because they have run out of funds."

Upstairs I found two long bare rooms—one filled with men and boys in chairs. They were the ones who could still pay for beds. The other was packed with men standing up, for whom there were no more meal tickets now. Among them a young Communist had distributed leaflets. "The nightmare of unemployment, misery, hunger and starvation hangs over the heads of all workers," I read. I asked Colonel Winchell what he was doing against such propaganda. "I am talking to them tonight about Abraham Lincoln," he said.

Several thousand men and boys are sleeping on the floors of missions and speakeasies near by. A cheap vile whisky is sold there, while from other sources the unemployed are buying "smoke," an alcohol so poisonous it makes a beginner sick for a week—and it slowly kills, if he keeps on. But it is cheap. For twenty-five cents three men and boys can get drunk on it. "It gets an awful hold," he said. "I can do almost anything with these boys, but when I take their 'smoke' away they'll fight for it as though for life, because it helps them to forget. But many won't touch it, and rather than sleep in dirty speakeasies they'll beg a nickel and ride around in the subway all night. For they're not bums and they try to stay clean; they're holding on, still hoping for jobs. For they feel, as I do, that things will improve in the early spring. I'm no calamity howler. I know we'll soon have better times. But it's tough to have your funds give out when you know how many men and boys could be helped to hold on for a few weeks more and not drop into the hobo class."

In this view he was supported by our New York Industrial Commissioner, Frances Perkins, who told me that since her report of Jan. 15 conditions of unemployment had shown few signs of betterment here. "We're hoping for improvement almost any time now," she said, "possibly in the early spring. But I'm afraid it will be slow—especially in the luxury trades and among the musicians. Thousands of them have lost their jobs since the talkies were introduced. There are thousands of idle clerks and stenographers and salesmen, too."

I saw one of them that afternoon. As I passed a long Bowery bread line, I heard a sudden chorus of jeers and a young man in the line who wore a white collar and neat light overcoat and hat was suddenly thrown out of his place. "Hey, you with the white collar, go on to the Y. M. C. A.," they yelled. I went to the Y. M. C. A. Bowery Branch over on East Third Street and talked with one of the managers there. "This is the worst winter I've seen since 1914," he said. "This January we could find jobs for only 124 out of 328 who applied; and of that 124 only thirty-nine got permanent work; the rest got jobs for but a few days and then were up against it again. Only thirty-nine real jobs for 329 who need them! We're hoping for improvement, but not till well along in March. And in the meantime what are we to do? We asked the New York public for $44,000 this year. We've had less than $24,000 of that; and so, with about half our budget we've had to turn away hundreds this month, and they don't know where

Correspondence

Make War Unconstitutional!

Editor of UNITY:

I read with much interest Sydney Strong's article on "The Man with the Sword." In order for this nation to do its share in getting "absolute disarmament," it is necessary that it amend its Constitution, as provided for in Senate Joint Resolution 45; which provides:

"War for any purpose shall be illegal, and neither the United States nor any State, Territory, association, or persons subject to its jurisdiction shall prepare for, declare, engage in, or carry on war or other armed conflict, expedition, invasion, or undertaking within or without the United States, nor shall any funds be raised, appropriated, or expended for such purpose."

So long as the United States Constitution remains as it is today, this nation is committed to the maintenance of war, for the Constitution makes it the business of the government to maintain armed forces and be prepared to engage in war—the wholesale murder of human beings. In other words, our Constitution at present provides that this nation shall harbor "the Man with the Sword," and the Supreme Court's decision in the Rosika Schwimmer case shows plainly how easy it is under the present form of the Constitution to strengthen the power of "the Man with the Sword" so long as war is constitutional. The Constitution itself must be amended if this nation is to disarm constitutionally. Fear is not a sufficient excuse for this nation making "the Man with the Sword" constitutional. On the same basis each of the nations could refuse to get rid of him, and thus cling to warfare in fear of others.

VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW.

Phoenix, Arizona.

Seminar in Mexico

Editor of UNITY: The Annual "Seminar in Mexico" holds its fifth session in Mexico City July 5-25. The Seminar affords an opportunity to a group of representative citizens of the United States to study the life and culture of the Mexican people. During the past four years it has been attended by educators, journalists, clergymen (Jewish, Protestant and Catholic) lawyers and business men. The program includes lectures by the leaders of Mexican life, educational, artistic, governmental. Controversial questions are presented by spokesmen for opposing views. The Seminar is planned as an objective study of the moving forces in Mexico, and is committed to no creedal, economic or political point of view. The critical discussion centers in the round-table groups which will be led this year by Professor J. Fred Rippy of Duke, Professor Chester Lloyd Jones of Wisconsin, Mr. Carleton Beals of Mexico, Dr. Ernest Gruening of Portland, Dr. John A. Lapp of Marquette, and Mr. Paul U. Kellogg of The Survey.

The members of the Seminar are given the opportunity to visit typical schools, villages, and archeological monuments. Trips to outlying sections of Mexico are arranged for those who can remain for an additional week or two.

The Seminar is a cooperative, non-profit undertaking.

We will be glad to hear from men and women who are interested in international relations, and whose professional or business connections give them an opportunity to influence public opinion.

HUBERT C. HERRING

The Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America.
112 East 19th Street
New York City.

to go. They have never been hoboes. In bread lines tonight you'll see fellows you'd never expect, clean, decent young men. They come to us so desperate they're willing to try any work. but even the roughest, humblest jobs this winter simply can't be found, for the men who hold them won't leave. So these others come to us—young office clerks and salesmen, who don't know how to sell themselves. They've never been up against it before and their suffering is so much the more intense when they find themselves on the street. We take them to our capacity here of 396 beds and we could help the others, too, if only we had money enough! All we need is ninety-one cents a day to give a man meals and a clean bed. But we simply can't get the funds."

I went back on the Bowery—darkening now, with lights flaring out of shops. In front of one stood a thin youngster with no overcoat. He was scowling at a radio from which a girl's voice sang to him: "Maybe I could get another man; but I'm waiting, dear, for you!" Down the street was a bonfire with a crowd around it. A huge Negro, very drunk and beating on an old tin pan, threw back his head and laughed up at the elevated. "I'm so happy—happy!" he roared. Near him I heard a thin little man, very dirty and also drunk, ask his friend: "What was it he said Jesus said?" The other one answered: "Aw, what the hell!"

By the Holy Name Mission close by I saw a line of hundreds reaching far around the corner down a darkening side street. Dim shadows, ghosts, and just for a moment I imagined another one there, a tall, stooped figure in a shawl and an old-fashioned stovepipe hat, who came slowly along the line as though reviewing a regiment long ago in the Civil War. For this was Lincoln's Birthday.

—*Ernest Poole.*

OPINIONS OF EMINENT AMERICANS ON INDIA AND BRITISH RULE

"If a nation robs another nation of its freedom, it does not deserve freedom for itself, and under a just God it will not long retain it."

—*Abraham Lincoln.*

"We fight for the liberation of all the world's peoples, for the rights of nations, great and small, and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience.

"We are fighting for the liberty, the self-government and the undictated development of all peoples . . . No people must be forced under sovereignty under it which it does not wish to live."

—*Woodrow Wilson.*

"England's educational policy in India is a blight on civilization. I have studied the problem pretty closely. In the latter part of the 18th century, Wilberforce, the English philanthropist, proposed to send school teachers to India, but a director of the East India Company objected saying, 'We have just lost America from our fold in allowing the establishment of schools and colleges, and it would not do for us to repeat the same act of folly in regard to India.'

"There are no free public schools in India (in British India) and no compulsory system of even primary education. Young Indians are hungry for education; and it is England's duty to do whatever she can to help the spread of education in that great country of ancient culture, and wonderful philosophy."

—*Dr. William T. Harris, U. S. Commissioner of Education, in an Address before the American Council of Education.*

"The fact that England treats Canada well, is no defence or justification of her when she abuses India. No nation on earth should be ruled without its consent."

—*George W. Norris,*
U. S. Senator from Nebraska.

(To be continued)

A Timely New Book

PALESTINE

TODAY AND TOMORROW

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Dr. Stephen S. Wise says: "It is the most understanding book that has been written about Palestine." It is also a most revealing book, based on a recent journey through Palestine and written largely since the recent riots between Jews and Arabs. The Zionist movement in all its aspects is graphically surveyed. You will finish this unusual exposition with a new understanding of Palestine and its problems.

Just Published by THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Price $2.50

Order from UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

MARCH

The expectant feeling of Spring is in the air. It's high time to get ready the new season's apparel—to start the big home cleaning. Therefore we suggest the cleansing of both garments and home furnishings by our process of continuous clarification—the most efficient possible.

Schumann & Co.
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue